

MINUTES
of the
Mental Health Planning Advisory Council
meeting on
February 6, 2002
held at
Holiday Inn Diamonds Casino
Sierra Room
1000 E 6th Street
Reno, NV 89512

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS

Alyce Thrash, Chair of the Council, called the meeting to order at 10:07 am.

Members present at roll call:

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| • Aitken, Nancy | • Jackson, Barbara |
| • Bennett, Bob | • Johnson, Rosetta |
| • Caloiaro, Dave | • Parra, Debbie |
| • Crowe, Kevin | • Rodriguez, Jenita |
| • Clark, Jerry | • Taycher, Karen |
| • Cooley, Judge W. | • Thrash, Alyce |
| • DeJan, Emil | • Uptergrove, Anna |
| • Doyle, Mike | |

Members absent at roll call:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| • Dopf, Gloria (excused) | • Legier, Barbara (excused) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|

Staff and others in attendance:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| • Cotton, Ed – DCFS | • Zeiser, Andrew– Administrative
Consultant |
|---------------------|--|

Alyce Thrash began by introducing Ed Cotton, the new Administrator for the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS). She then asked the Council members and staff to introduce themselves for the benefit of the guests and other new members present today.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

Alyce Thrash asked for comments and questions on the minutes set forth for approval from the following meetings: November 1, November 16, and December 14, 2001. None were made. She then requested a motion for approval.

MOTION: Made by Mike Doyle, seconded by Kevin Crowe, to approve the minutes from the above meetings as submitted.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

III. REVIEW AND APPROVE PROPOSED BYLAW REVISIONS

Alyce Thrash began by asking for discussion on the revisions to Article II of the bylaws, Membership, as outlined in the meeting packets. Bob Bennett said he believes it is possible to interpret the revisions in two ways: Either proxies are only allowed to vote for specific items as instructed prior to a meeting, or they are allowed to draw their own conclusions based on discussion at a given meeting. Discussion followed about the intent of the language. Bob stated that he would like a proxy to have a certain amount of latitude in voting after an issue is discussed at a meeting. Karen Taycher suggested that the member designating a proxy can indicate whether they want specific votes made or empower their proxy to make their own decisions about action items in the written notice. Alyce agreed this is a good recommendation. Andrew Zeiser noted it would fit with the revised language as presented.

Anna Uptergrove brought up the termination of the Peer Advocate program at Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS), and Alyce said this would be discussed under the Executive Report. She then asked if there was any further discussion on the bylaw revisions. Dave Caloiaro confirmed that the proposed language would not have to change based on Bob's question. Alyce and Andrew agreed. Alyce then requested a motion for approval.

MOTION: Made by Nancy Aitken, seconded by Barbara Jackson, to approve the proposed revisions to Article II of the Council bylaws as outlined in notice sent in the meeting packets.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

IV. REVIEW REVISED COUNCIL BUDGETS FOR FY 2001 AND 2002

Alyce Thrash began by mentioning the small increase approved for the CMHS Block Grant in FY 2002, totaling approximately \$96,000 for Nevada. She then asked Andrew Zeiser to review the changes to the FY 2001 and 2002 Council budgets. Andrew distributed updated copies of each year's budget and briefly explained the changes. For FY 2001, a line item had to be added indicating a subgrant would be awarded to fund the Joint Retreat with the Mental Health and

Developmental Services (MHDS) Commission planned for this evening and tomorrow. This was in keeping with the Council's request to use leftover FY 2001 funds for this event. For FY 2002, Andrew indicated that a similar line item was projected to allow for another meeting with the Commission during the upcoming fiscal year, if desired by the Council. The projected amount was decreased slightly from the proposed budget approved at the December 14, 2001, meeting, and allowed for a small increase to the consumer education and training line item. Andrew concluded by noting that these were informational items only: The FY 2001 budget was approved last year and was amended only at the request of MHDS fiscal staff to meet their requirements for the Joint Retreat subgrant, and the FY 2002 budget was approved at the last meeting.

Rosetta Johnson brought up her desire to not limit consumer services awards to programs only targeted for consumers and family members. Barbara Jackson asked if Rosetta is requesting more funds for this line item. Rosetta said no, just that she does not want to limit the scope of the awards. Alyce pointed out that the request for proposal (RFP) used last year already allows for a much greater range of awarding funds to different groups. Rosetta reiterated that the line item appears too limiting based on its name: consumer education/training. Andrew pointed out that this line item is labeled as such for fiscal convenience only and reiterated Alyce's point that the actual scope of awards is outlined in detail in the RFP. Kevin suggested that the line item name could be changed. Alyce asked what Rosetta suggests, and she said 'consumer and family member education and training.' Alyce asked for input from the rest of the group. Andrew suggested calling it 'RFP subgrant awards' so that it remains as broad as possible. Rosetta agreed to this.

Bob Bennett then said he is planning to attend a grant writing class and asked if he can seek grants on behalf of the Council. Nancy Aitken brought up the difficulty of the Council accepting gifts to the State, such as what happened with the computers purchased for consumer use at NNAMHS. Alyce, Nancy, and Barbara suggested he focus on writing grants for other consumer groups. Rosetta noted that her organization, Human Potential Development, recently sponsored a training program for staff at NNAMHS as an example of grants that could be written to benefit consumers.

V. REVIEW NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION TOOLKITS

Andrew Zeiser and Kevin Crowe distributed the new member orientation toolkits to the Council members. Alyce Thrash began by asking that the members watch the video presentation developed by the National Association of Mental Health Planning and Advisory Councils (NAMHPAC) before reviewing the toolkit contents in detail. The video was presented.

Ed Cotton asked how the video might be used outside of the Council. Alyce said she would welcome suggestions from the members on who might benefit from viewing it.

Andrew then briefly reviewed the content he developed for the orientation toolkit, which includes the member roster, Council bylaws, Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS) Block Grant outline, a summary of State travel policies and procedures, and sample travel claim forms.

He also explained the personnel forms to be completed by the new members in order to make them eligible for stipend reimbursements. Karen Taycher complimented Andrew on the information pertaining to travel policies and procedures and travel claim explanations.

Alyce then highlighted the committee information on pages 3-2 through 3-3 in the officers and committees section. She also reviewed the acronyms and glossary. Karen said that she has an additional list of acronyms that she can send to add to the toolkit that are more specific to Nevada.

Emil DeJan suggested that under the additional resources section he would like to develop a list of Nevada-based resources. Karen said that she also has a State resource list available that she can provide to help with this section. Alyce said if anyone else has additional items to suggest for the toolkits to please bring them to her attention.

Following up on Ed Cotton's suggestion, she asked if the members have recommendations about how the video could be used. Ed said that staff within DCFS might be helped by knowing about MHPACs. Andrew said he would contact Sue Ballew to let her know how additional copies can be obtained.

Mike Doyle suggested that the MHDS Commission members should see it. Alyce said she has talked with Fran Brown about showing it at a future Commission meeting. Karen suggested that the video be available as a resource for community and consumer groups. This would help families and others be encouraged to take an advocacy role. Alyce discussed how her organization, the Mental Health Association of Southern Nevada, would include it as part of their resource library.

Dave Caloiaro said that not only is it good to use the video as an educational tool about what the Council does, but it also could be used as a recruitment tool for new members. Karen asked if there is a charge for additional videos. Andrew and Alyce said they believe it is approximately \$5. Alyce said she would check into getting permission to copy the tapes here. Kevin suggested there is a local company in Carson that could copy the tapes.

Emil suggested that a presentation about the MHPAC, along with the video, might be made to the Interim Health Committee. Alyce said she would be happy to make presentations to different groups based on requests from the Council members. Rosetta suggested including a written component. Karen agreed and suggested using the Statewide Information Network sign-up form already developed by the Council.

Barbara said she was disappointed not to see more consumers in the video and she did not feel represented in it. Andrew noted that there were consumers and family members in the video. More discussion followed about this. Karen asked about the development of the video and the toolkit. Andrew explained that a Committee was convened by Chuck Ingoglia at NAMHPAC to develop both the national toolkit contents and the video. He suggested that feedback might be directed to Chuck. More discussion followed about the representation of consumers in the development of the toolkits and video.

Rosetta followed up by stating that Councils exist for consumers and family members and reiterated that they must be comprised of greater than 50% of consumers and family members along with State representation. She said the Council is the place where consumers are recognized and that it is an honor that they are able to participate in the process here. She said that this is the first place where consumers can work to erase stigma. Karen asked that Andrew and the Chair communicate with Chuck Ingoglia that the Council is in support of Barbara's statement that consumers should be represented more prominently in the video. Mike said he sees that all opinions on the Council are valued equally and that this is part of reducing stigma. He believes that all members are seen as equal and valuable in their participation.

Dave Caloiaro echoed Barbara's concern that the individual consumer should be represented in the video, rather than their association with broader groups such as the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI), the National Mental Health Associations (NMHA), etc. Anna Uptergrove noted that some consumers do not know what their needs are and do need to be helped and represented by others at some times. More discussion followed about the nature of consumer representation and self help efforts.

VI. REVIEW AND DISCUSS VENTURE GRANT PROCESS

Alyce Thrash began by stating that the venture grant process discussed at the prior meeting is basically identical to what the Council does through its RFP process and that the Council probably does not need to develop separate methods for awarding funds. Andrew Zeiser agreed and noted that upon following up on the venture grant processes in place with nonprofits and other state groups, he found that the applications used required as much detail as the existing RFP. He explained that organizations with large budgets for awarding funds will often engage in an annual RFP process to award larger amounts of money targeted at broader service provision, and then use a venture grant process to award smaller amounts of money targeted at pilot projects or one-shot activities. He suggested that because the Council awards a small amount each year, it would be best to not make the process too complex or time consuming, particularly since the RFP process is only a part of the Council's overall workload. He suggested it would be better for the Council to review the existing RFP and make suggestions for refining it prior to the next meeting when it will be finalized for release. He then distributed copies of the FY 2002 RFP for the Council to review.

Alyce said that although no major changes are being made today to the RFP, she wants to highlight the issue of the computers placed at NNAMHS, the problems associated with this, and the replacement of the Peer Advocate program with the Canteen program. She suggested that based on the difficulty encountered with both programs, the Council might consider whether they want to continue awarding funds to state agencies. Jerry Clark agreed that it does not make sense that the Council awards funds to state agencies since both DCFS and MHDS receive the bulk of CMHS funds through the block grant.

Mike Doyle noted that some of the proposals received last year by State agencies contained good ideas, even if they were not implemented as hoped. Nancy Aitken agreed, saying that she believes the State mental health system does not have enough money and staff often has a lot of

good ideas that can be tried out on a small scale with RFP funds. Jerry suggested that consumers could be funded to do some of the same things. Alyce brought up New Wish and discussed the value of this program.

Karen Taycher suggested that the Council should not ‘throw the baby out with the bath water’ and that limits could be set within the RFP for State agencies such that if programs end that purchased equipment is returned to the Council, a commitment is made to continue programs with State funds, or other possible stipulations. Alyce pointed out that this was addressed with the Attorney General’s office, but the problem with the State receiving tangible goods was made clear in that once equipment is purchased, it belongs to the State. More discussion followed about this.

Nancy said that she believes the Council members are capable of evaluating the proposals and making informed decisions about awarding funds. Alyce said she is not saying the State should be excluded per se, but that the Council should consider what has happened with past subgrants.

Mike Doyle suggested a grant award review committee could be formed that would look at program evaluation for subgrantees. Andrew indicated that a presentation from FY 2002 grantees is planned for the next Council meeting. Ann Uptergrove suggested that changes could be made in the RFP to address the problems encountered with subgrantees. Ed Cotton asked about the provision in the existing RFP that preference is given to consumers and asked if extra points are given to consumer proposals or if it is addressed during proposal review. Alyce said it is addressed during discussion about the proposals.

Emil DeJan suggested that the RFP criteria might be expanded to account for more of these limitations. Andrew brought up the time frame and process for this year, explaining that the RFP changes would have to be finalized at the May Council meeting, with a planned release of the RFP in early June, a due date set for proposals in late June, and scheduled proposal evaluation and awards at the July Council meeting. Karen asked that Andrew send out an e-mail reminder for comments on existing RFP format prior to the May meeting.

Debbie Parra asked about possible oral reviews of applicants. Andrew suggested keeping proposal reviews restricted to a paper-based process because of the burden of the oral review process, which requires travel by applicants and extensive time commitment on the part of the Council members. Alyce reiterated that last year’s recipients would be scheduled to discuss the implementation of their subgrants at the next Council meeting.

Alyce then brought up question of a location for the planned May 10 reception. She suggested it would be fair to have it in Las Vegas since this week’s meetings and reception are being held in Reno. Emil agreed that it should be held in Las Vegas. Kevin Crowe reminded Alyce that CMHS is conducting a monitoring visit in May and that it might be good to have the reception in Reno. However, it was noted that the federal representatives travel to north, south, and rural areas, so it could be scheduled either in the north or south. More discussion followed. Andrew and Kevin suggested making the location and date tentative based on the federal monitoring schedule. Alyce asked for further discussion on the topic and no additional comments were made.

**** The meeting broke for lunch at 12:00 pm, then resumed at 1:00 pm.*

VII. EXECUTIVE REPORT – ALYCE THRASH

Alyce Thrash began by asking Jerry Clark to provide an update on the DCFS Managed Care Workgroup. Jerry provided an overview of the group, which began work during February, 2001, under the guidance of a national consultant, Carl Valentine, to explore the use of managed care to provide children's mental health services. He discussed the stakeholders and agency representatives in the group. The workgroup recently completed a proposal to the new Division Administrator, Ed Cotton, which has been written in a way such that the Administrator can consider all or portions of the proposal. Jerry underscored that this is not a commitment to use managed care, but rather serves as a recommendation to the Administrator on how managed care might be utilized effectively in Nevada.

Emil DeJan asked who the representatives from the managed care industry were. Jerry said that there were none, but rather the national consultant was brought in to provide his expertise on national managed care implementation. He educated the workgroup about other states' projects and development in this area. Jerry said DCFS did not want private sector representatives to come in at the planning stage because one of the primary issues to be determined was whether or not managed care would be used.

Alyce then brought up the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) meeting she attended yesterday regarding the proposal to convert Peer Counselors to State employees. Alyce said that IFC approved six new Peer Counselors to be funded with the money now used to contract with Caminar. Alyce noted that the IFC approval was unanimous and mentioned that she already met with Sandra Silva of State Personnel to begin working with her to develop the series concept for the positions. Once developed, other divisions could introduce Peer Specialists within their agencies, such as welfare and rehabilitation. Alyce noted that they would be called Peer Specialists, reflecting a national trend away from calling them counselors in order to prevent confusion about licensing and educational status. Debbie Parra asked if they will be mental health employees. Alyce answered yes, but underscored that she would like to see the State expand the program to other agencies including welfare. She is hoping that Peer Specialists will enhance relationships with professionals that already work to serve consumers within the system.

Dave Caloiaro asked about minimum qualifications. Alyce said it is part of the job of Personnel to develop these requirements. Barbara Jackson asked if the training used for these new positions will be the same as that used by Caminar. Alyce said she is working with Fran Brown to develop a curriculum in Nevada that is similar to that used in California. Karen Taycher asked if a mechanism is being built in so that Medicaid can be billed for Peer Specialist hours. Alyce said they are first focusing on developing the series prior to requesting this, however she has spoken with Dave Caloiaro about it. Also, she mentioned the possibility of developing an Office of Consumer Affairs that would involve the Peer Specialists.

Kevin Crowe noted that since the program is currently 100% federally funded, in the future MHDS would have to build State dollars into it in order to bill Medicaid because federal programs cannot bill Medicaid. Karen confirmed that Kevin is saying that federally funded positions cannot bill Medicaid for direct care services. Kevin said this was his understanding. Karen said this does not seem correct. Dave said that his understanding is that there are complex funding pass through issues that affect the way services are billed and that position qualifications also affect this. His understanding is that for positions that rely on mixed funding, i.e. both State general fund and federal, he is aware of billing being possible but that he is not certain about 100% federally funded positions.

Karen said she is aware of federally funded positions that bill Medicaid. Rosetta Johnson asked why they would want to bill the feds for this. Alyce and Karen said the goal is to bring as many dollars as possible into Nevada, regardless of whether they come from different federal sources. More discussion followed about the possibility of billing for services provided by Peer Specialists. Dave Caloiaro reiterated that position qualifications must meet certain minimums to be paid for with Medicaid dollars. Karen then asked if clarification could be given on *programs* being funded by Medicaid versus *positions* being funded. Dave agreed to look into it.

Rosetta then asked how these new positions will be supervised. Alyce said that MHDS is working with Personnel to develop a statewide coordinator position that would be partially responsible for supervision, but also the Peer Specialists would report to different staff persons at the agencies in the north, south, and rural areas. Rosetta asked if the statewide coordinator would be in addition to the six Peer Specialists. Alyce said the statewide coordinator and five Peer Specialists would be hired. Kevin noted that Caminar provided four positions and a half-time statewide coordinator under the existing contract. He then mentioned some of the obstacles encountered with Caminar and discussed some of the ideal functions of the statewide coordinator in relation to agency supervisors. He pointed out the value of integrating and developing the process as part of the State system.

Rosetta then asked if the statewide coordinator would make more than the other Peer Specialists. Kevin said they are working to build this into the personnel classification development. He then discussed sample salaries: Entry level specialists would start around \$26,000 per year with benefits, and the coordinator around \$31,000. Alyce noted that Personnel staff is suggesting that the coordinator will probably come in at a higher grade level. Alyce said the key point is that the coordinator will be a consumer as well as the other specialists. She noted that they may have to reduce the total number to five staff positions in order to accommodate the salary differential for the statewide coordinator.

Alyce moved on to briefly discuss her participation in the Train the Trainers program offered by NAMHPAC. She noted the work done by trainers with other Councils, including work with the new orientation toolkits. She also brought up a national group working to develop a curriculum for Peer Specialists.

She then brought up Ticket To Work and said the implementation date of this program is projected to be October, 2002. There are two components of the program: tickets taken to employers and Medicaid buy-in. Based on this, she said there is no target date for the Medicaid

buy-in and that the October date is for the work tickets only. Alyce said this is problematic because people who return to work need to be ensured that they will still receive benefits. She discussed the problem of returning to work without benefits, which is the primary reason this program was developed. She then discussed other details that affect the provision of benefits to families.

Karen noted there was an article in the Las Vegas newspaper recently that was misleading about the implementation date of the program and asked if there is a way to prevent misinformation from being released. Alyce discussed the problem between the workgroup's efforts and press from the Governor's office. Also, she noted the problem between understanding the ticket to work versus Medicaid buy-in.

Dave asked how Nevada compares with other states in their progress. Alyce said that Arizona and New Mexico are already working the program, but that other states such as Idaho took up to four years to implement the program. She noted that states which have already implemented the program are having to rethink the implementation of the program because of the problems between tickets versus Medicaid buy-in. Alyce then asked if there are any other comments or questions on Ticket To Work. None were made. She noted that the workgroup members are currently looking to develop a network for employers who may participate in the program. Kevin asked how extensive she believes the network will be. Alyce said initial interest is high, but the implementation time frame is creating some problems, along with the fact that reimbursements are made to employers after the fact. More discussion followed.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Alyce Thrash began by asking the Council members for any new business items. Bob Bennett said that he is a member of a NAMI network called "Know How," which alerted consumers that a conference is being held in Las Vegas that is alleged to exclude consumers and to include a 'consumers from hell' workshop focused on how to deal with difficult consumers. Bob said he asked Alyce if the Council has concerns about this and she suggested he bring it up during the meeting today. Jerry Clark and Dave Caloiaro asked who is sponsoring this conference. Bob said it is the Psychiatric Congress, which includes social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists. Andrew Zeiser confirmed that there is actually a scheduled workshop called 'consumers from hell.' Bob answered yes. Alyce asked if the Council wants to take any action on this. She noted that as an individual consumer, she will be writing to the organizers about this. However, she believes the Council may need more information before they make any kind of formal statement. Ed Cotton asked if there is anything concrete that excludes consumers. Bob said he was told that verbally and via e-mail. Ed said he would like to see some documentation that consumers are excluded from this event before taking action. More discussion followed.

Nancy Aitken suggested that National NAMI might be able to help Bob with this. Alyce again asked if the Council wants to advocate against this as a group. Karen Taycher agreed that more information is needed. She and Jerry requested that they see a brochure or some schedule of events that supports the discussion. Karen noted that if the conference is not until October, this

would give the Council time to decide about making a statement about this. She brought up an example from the field of education training where similar problems occur.

Emil DeJan asked if there could be discussion about the meeting tomorrow with the MHDS Commission. Alyce said her understanding is that the primary goal is for the Council members to ‘get our feet wet’ and figure out what the role of the two groups might be together. Mike Doyle said his understanding is that part of the goal tomorrow is to understand how they might coordinate legislative action. Rosetta Johnson said that the Commission has both power and responsibility and because of that, they receive important information from inside the system. She said she would like to see the Council get this kind of information.

Barbara Jackson brought up a statement that was allegedly made by a Commission member that they only desire to work with NAMI. Alyce said she brought this up with Fran Brown, who emphasized that the Commission desires to work with a variety of stakeholders. More discussion followed about the role of the Commission and their membership composition.

Emil said his concern is that the Commission members have a set agenda and the Council does not. Judge Cooley pointed out that this is primarily an informational meeting to understand the work of the two groups, open the doors of communication, and discuss possible joint work in the future. More discussion followed about possible work that might be done. Mike suggested that positions on mental health issues supported by both the Council and the Commission would be important in the eyes of the Governor.

Emil reiterated his concerns. Judge Cooley again said her understanding is that the intent was not to come with a set agenda, but rather to come with an open mind. Ed Cotton said he agrees that not coming with a set agenda makes for a better opportunity for both groups to work together. More discussion followed about possible goals and discussion items for the meeting tomorrow. Kevin Crowe emphasized that this would be the first of a sequence of meetings that may help achieve some of the goals discussed.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public attendees made their comments to the Council under the above agenda items.

X. REVIEW DATE, TIME, LOCATION, AND TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

The date and location for the next Council meeting was discussed under item six above. Ed Cotton suggested that the mental health consortiums established under Assembly Bill (AB) 1 should be put on the Council’s agenda at a future meeting. Alyce Thrash said that in other states MHPACs meet more often to address legislative issues and said she wants the Council members to consider meeting more often and/or develop subcommittee work.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 pm.